| 1<br>2        | MELINDA HAAG (CSBA 132612)<br>United States Attorney<br>JOANN M. SWANSON (CSBN 88143)            |
|---------------|--|
| 3             | Chief, Civil Division ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS (CSBN 146400)   |
| 4             | Assistant United States Attorney   |
| <b>-</b><br>5 | 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor<br>San Francisco, California 94102-3495                        |
| 6             | Telephone: (415) 436-7264 Facsimile: (415) 436-6748 Email: abraham.simmons@usdoj.gov             |
| 7             |  |
| 8             | Attorneys for Federal Defendants   |
| 9             | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |
| 10            | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |
| 11            | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION   |
| 12            |  |
| 13            | THE SIERRA CLUB and ) Case No. C 11-0846 MEJ ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY )                           |
| 14            | PROJECT, ) DEFENDANT'S SECOND UNOPPOSED  |
| 15            | Plaintiffs, ) <b>ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO</b> AUGMENT BRIEFING SCHEDULE;                         |
| 16            | v. ) <b>DECLARATION OF COUNSEL;</b><br>(PROPOSED) ORDER  |
| 17            | UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL ) PROTECTION AGENCY, )   |
| 18            | Defendant.   |
| 19            | <u> </u>   |
| 20            | ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION  |
| 21            | Defendant United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") by its attorney, the             |
| 22            | United States Attorney for the Northern District of California, hereby requests a change in this |
| 23            | Court's January 25, 2012 briefing schedule. Specifically, Defendant respectfully requests that   |
| 24            | the Court consider defendant's February 13, 2012 brief as timely filed and extend the time for   |
| 25            | Plaintiffs to file their Opposition and Cross-Motion to March 19, 2012. The remaining dates,     |
| 26            | including the hearing date, would remain the same.   |
| 27            | This request is made on the ground that it is unopposed and two of the declarants                |
| 28            | providing evidentiary support for defendant's motion were unavailable to sign their declarations |

 in a timely manner.

## **FACTS**

Plaintiffs filed this action pursuant to the FOIA and the APA on February 23, 2011. The matter was referred to mediation on June 6, 2011. [Docket No. 17.] After several attempts to resolve the matter, the case did not settle. In their November 17, 2011 status report, the parties presented the court with a proposed briefing schedule to resolve the issues by cross-motions for summary judgment.[Docket No. 22.] The court adopted the proposed schedule in its November 21, 2011 order. [Docket No. 23.] According to the schedule, defendant's motion was due by January 13, 2012, plaintiff's opposition and cross-motion was due February 10, 1012, and replies were due March 9, 2012 for an April 10, 2010 hearing on the cross motions.

Defendant was been unable to collect the information necessary to prepare its motion for summary judgment by the January 13, 2012 due date for motions. On January 25, 2010, this court granted defendant's unopposed motion to adjust the briefing schedule and set the following deadlines:

Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment: February 3, 2012

Plaintiffs' Opposition, Cross-Motion: March 9, 2012

Defendant's Reply, Opposition: March 30, 2012

Plaintiffs' Reply: April 27, 2012

Hearing: May 10, 2012, at 10:00 a.m.

The defendant's motion for summary judgment relies principally on the declarations of Leticia Lane and Janet Adams. These witnesses were unavailable to sign their declarations in a timely matter. A signed version of the Lane declaration did not become available until February 8, 2012 and the signed version of the Adams declaration did not become available until February 13, 2012.

Plaintiffs have indicated they would not object to the defendant's motion to change to February 13, 2012 the filing deadline for its summary judgment motion so long as the motion

1 does not change the hearing date for the motions and sets the following deadlines: 2 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment: February 13, 2012 3 March 19, 2012 Plaintiff's Opposition, Cross-Motion: 4 Defendant's Reply: March 30, 2012 5 Plaintiffs' Reply: April 27, 2012 6 Hearing: May 10, 2012 7 Defendant agreed to submit a request for the court to order these new dates. 8 Respectfully submitted, 9 **MELINDA HAAG** United States Attorney 10 11 Dated: February 15, 2012 12 ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS 13 Assistant United States Attorney Attorneys for the Federal Defendants 14 **DECLARATION OF COUNSEL** 15 16 I, Abraham A. Simmons, do hereby declare under penalty of perjury the following: 17 I am the Assistant United States Attorney assigned to this case. I make this declaration of 18 my own knowledge and would competently testify to the facts in this declaration if called upon to 19 do so. 20 Plaintiffs filed this action pursuant to the FOIA and the APA on February 23, 2011. The 2. 21 matter was referred to mediation on June 6, 2011. After several attempts to resolve the matter, 22 the case did not settle. 23 In their November 17, 2011 status report, the parties presented the court with a proposed 24 briefing schedule to resolve the issues by cross-motions for summary judgment. The court 25 26 adopted the proposed schedule in its November 21, 2011 order. According to the schedule, 27 defendant's motion was due by January 13, 2012, plaintiff's opposition and cross-motion was 28 FEDERAL DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME 3 C 11-00846 MEJ

due February 10, 1012, and replies were due March 9, 2012 for an April 10, 2010 hearing on the cross motions.

- 4. Defendant has been unable to collect and provide to me the information necessary for me to prepare its motion for summary judgment by the January 13, 2012 due date for motions.
- 5. I communicated with plaintiff's counsel, David A. Bahr, regarding defendant's inability to meet this court's deadline. Mr. Bahr informed me that plaintiff had no objection to defendant requesting a three-week extension of time to file its motion.
- 6. The defendant's motion for summary judgment relies principally on the declarations of Leticia Lane and Janet Adams. I am informed and believe these witnesses were unavailable to sign their declarations in a timely matter. On February 10, 2012, Mr. Bahr graciously agreed to not oppose a request to extend the filing deadline to February 13, 2012 so long as the hearing date for the motion did not change and the court ordered the following dates:

Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment: February 13, 2012

Plaintiff's Opposition, Cross-Motion: March 19, 2012

Defendant's Reply: March 30, 2012

Plaintiffs' Reply: April 27, 2012

Hearing: May 10, 2012

The effect of the schedule is to maintain the hearing date but shorten the time for defendants to respond to plaintiffs' opposition and cross-motion.

7. A signed version of the Lane declaration did not become available until February 8, 2012 and the signed version of the Adams declaration did not become available until February 13, 2012.

I swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true. Sworn this 15<sup>th</sup> day in February, 2012 in San Francisco, California.

Abraham A. Simmons

## **|PROPOSED|** ORDER

Defendant's request to augment the briefing schedule is granted, the parties will observe the following briefing and hearing schedule:

Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment: February 13, 2012

Plaintiff's Opposition, Cross-Motion: March 19, 2012

Defendant's Reply: March 30, 2012

Plaintiffs' Reply: April 27, 2012

Hearing: May 10, 2012

Date: February  $\frac{16}{2}$ , 2012

Chief United Magistrate Judge